arXiv:1610.03522v1 [math.PR] 11 Oct 2016

Supermarket Queueing System in the Heavy Traffic Regime. Short Queue Dynamics

Patrick Eschenfeldt and David Gamarnik

October 13, 2016

Abstract

We consider a queueing system with n parallel queues operating according to the so-called "supermarket model" in which arriving customers join the shortest of d randomly selected queues. Assuming rate $n\lambda_n$ Poisson arrivals and rate 1 exponentially distributed service times, we consider this model in the heavy traffic regime, described by $\lambda_n \uparrow 1$ as $n \to \infty$. We give a simple expectation argument establishing that majority of queues have steady state length at least $\log_d(1-\lambda_n)^{-1} - O(1)$ with probability approaching one as $n \to \infty$, implying the same for the steady state delay of a typical customer.

Our main result concerns the detailed behavior of queues with length *smaller* than $\log_d(1-\lambda_n)^{-1} - O(1)$. Assuming λ_n converges to 1 at a sublinear rate in n, we show that the dynamics of such queues does not follow a diffusion process, as is typical for queueing systems in heavy traffic, but is described instead by a deterministic infinite system of linear differential equations, after an appropriate rescaling. The unique fixed point solution of this system is shown explicitly to be of the form $\pi_1(d^i - 1)/(d-1), i \geq 1$, which we conjecture describes the steady state behavior of the queue lengths after the same rescaling. Our result is obtained by combination of several technical ideas including the usage of a truncated geometric norm inducing the standard product topology on $\mathbb{R}^\infty$, establishing the existence and uniqueness of an associated infinite dimensional system of non-linear integral equations, and adopting an appropriate stopped process as an intermediate step.

1 Introduction.

In this paper we consider the so-called supermarket model in the heavy traffic regime. The supermarket model is a parallel server queueing system consisting of n identical servers which process jobs at rate 1 Poisson process. The jobs arrive into the system according to a Poisson process with rate $n\lambda_n$ where λ_n is assumed to be strictly smaller than unity for stability. A positive integer parameter d is fixed. Each arriving customer chooses d servers uniformly at random and selects a server with the smallest number of jobs in the corresponding queue, ties broken uniformly at random. The queue within each server is processed according to the First-In-First-Out rule. We denote this system by $M/M/n$-Sup(d).

The foundational work on this model was done by Dobrushin, Karpelevich and Vvedenskaya [16] and Mitzenmacher [13], who independently showed that when $\lambda_n = \lambda < 1$ is a fixed constant and $d \geq 2$, the steady state probability that the customer encounters a queue with length at least t (and hence experiences the delay at least t in expectation), is of the form λ^{d^t}. Namely it is doubly exponential in t. This is in sharp contrast with the case $d = 1$, where each server behaves as an $M/M/1$ system with load λ and hence the steady state delay has the exponential tail of the form λ^t. This phenomena has its static counterpart in the form of so-called Balls-Into-Bins model. In this model n balls are thrown sequentially into n bins where for each ball d bins are chosen uniformly at random and the bin with the smallest number of balls is chosen. It is well known that for this model the largest bin has $O(\log \log n)$ balls when $d \geq 2$ as opposed to $O(\log n)$ balls when $d = 1$. This known as "Power-of-Two" phenomena.

The development in [16] and [13] is based on the fluid limit approximations for the infinite dimensional process, where each coordinate corresponds to the fraction of servers with at least i jobs. By taking n to infinity, it is shown that the limiting system can be described by a deterministic infinite system of differential equations, which have a unique and simple to describe fixed point satisfying doubly exponential decay rate. Some of the subsequent work that has been performed on the supermarket model and its variations can be found in [1–3, 5, 8–12, 14, 15, 17].

In this paper we consider the supermarket model in the heavy traffic regime described by having the arrival rate parameter $\lambda_n \uparrow 1$. The work of Brightwell and Luczak [4] considers the model which is the closest to the one considered in this paper. They also assume that $\lambda_n \uparrow 1$, but at the same time they assume that the parameter d diverges to infinity as well. In our setting d remains constant as is the case for the classical supermarket

model. More precisely, we assume that as n increases, d is fixed, but $\lambda_n = 1 - \beta/\eta_n$ where $\beta > 0$ is fixed and $\lim_n \eta_n = \infty$. Our goal is conducting the performance analysis of the system both at the process level and in steady state. Unfortunately, the fluid limit approach of [16] and [13] is rendered useless since in this case the corresponding fluid limit trivializes to a system of differential equations describing the critical system corresponding to $\lambda_n = \lambda = 1$. At the same time, however, certain educated guesses can be inferred from the case when $\lambda < 1$ is constant, namely the classical setting. From the λ^{d^i} tail behavior which describes the fraction of servers with at least i customers in steady state, it can be inferred that when $\lambda \uparrow 1$, if $i^* = o\left(\log_d \frac{1}{1-\lambda}\right)$ then

$$\lambda^{d^{i^*}} = \lambda^{o\left(\frac{1}{1-\lambda}\right)},$$

which approaches unity as $\lambda \uparrow 1$. Namely, the fraction of servers with at most i^* customers becomes negligible. Of course this does not apply rigorously to our heavy traffic regime as it amounts to first taking the limit in n and only then taking the limit in λ, whereas in the heavy traffic regime this is done simultaneously. Nevertheless, our main results confirm this behavior both at the process level and in the steady state regime. In terms of our notation for λ_n, we show that when ω_n is an arbitrary sequence diverging to infinity and

$$i_n^* = \log_d \frac{1}{1-\lambda_n} - \omega_n = \log_d \eta_n - \log_d \beta - \omega_n, \tag{1}$$

(note that the term $\log_d \beta$ is subsumed by ω_n) the fraction of queues with at most i_n^* customers is $o(1)$ with probability approaching unity as n increases. The intuitive explanation for this is as above:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n^{d^{i_n^*}} &= (1-\beta/\eta_n)^{\frac{d^{-\omega_n}}{1-\lambda_n}} \\
&= (1-\beta/\eta_n)^{\frac{\eta_n}{\beta d^{\omega_n}}} \\
&\approx e^{-\frac{1}{d^{\omega_n}}} \\
&\to 1,
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

We now describe our results and our approach at some level of detail. First we give a very simple expectation based argument showing that in steady state the expected fraction of servers with at least i customers is at least $1 - \frac{\beta}{\eta_n}\frac{d^i-1}{d-1}$. Plugging here the value for i_n^* given in (1) the expression

becomes $1 - 1/d^{\omega_n} \to 1$, as $n \to \infty$, confirming the claimed behavior in steady state. This immediately implies that the steady state delay experienced by a typical customer is at least i_n^* with probability approaching 1 as n diverges. This result is formally stated in Theorem 5.

Our main result concerns the detailed process level behavior of queues, with the eye towards queues of length at most i_n^*. As is customary in the heavy traffic theory, the first step is applying an appropriate rescaling step, and thus for each $i \leq i_n^*$, letting $S_i^n(t)$ denote the fraction of servers with at most i jobs at time t, we introduce a rescaled process $T_i^n(t) \triangleq \eta_n(1 - S_i^n(t))$. We prove that the sequence $T^n = (T_i^n(t), t \geq 0, i \geq 1)$ converges weakly to some deterministic limiting process $T = (T_i(t), t \geq 0, i \geq 1)$, provided that the system starts in a state where $T_i^n(0)$ has a non-trivial limit as $n \to \infty$, and provided η_n grows at most sub-linearly in n. We show that the process $T(t)$ is the unique solution to a deterministic infinite system of linear differential equations (given by (10) in the body of the paper).

This is the main technical result of the paper. This result is perhaps somewhat surprising since the processes arising as heavy traffic limits of queueing systems is usually a diffusion, and not a deterministic process as it is in our case. We further show that the unique fixed point of the process $T(t) = (T_i(t), i \geq 0)$ is of the form $\pi_i = \pi_1(d^i - 1)/(d - 1)$, consistent with our result regarding the lower bound on steady state expectation of S_i^n discussed above. We also show that this fixed point is an attraction point of the process $T(t)$ and the convergence occurs exponentially fast.

Our main result regarding the weak convergence of the rescaled process T^n to T is obtained by employing several technical steps. The first step is writing the term $\left(S_{i-1}^n\right)^d - (S_i^n)^d = (1 - T_{i-1}^n/\eta_n)^d - (1 - T_i^n/\eta_n)^d$ (which corresponds to the likelihood that the arriving job increases the fraction of servers with at least i jobs), as a sum of a linear function $dT_i^n/\eta_n - dT_{i-1}^n/\eta_n$ plus the correction term dg^{η_n}/η_n, where g^{η_n} is the appropriate correction function, and then showing that this correction has a smaller order of magnitude provided $i \leq i_n^*$. Our next idea is employing a metric which is a truncated geometric norm of the form $\kappa(x, y) = \sum_i \rho^{-i} \min(|x_i - y_i|, 1)$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ for appropriately chosen $\rho > 1$. This metric is utilized to facilitate weak convergence on the product space $\mathbb{R}^\infty$ as well as separating queues with length at most i_n^* from the remaining queues. Then, we prove the existence, uniqueness and continuity property of the stochastic integral equation governing the behavior of the rescaled queue length counting process $(T_i^n, t \geq 0, i \geq 1)$, up to an appropriately chosen stopping time intended to prevent T_i^n from "growing too much". The stopping time utilized in this

theorem is similar to the one employed by the authors in a different paper [6]. Finally, we apply the martingale method by splitting the underlying stochastic processes into one part which is a martingale and the compensating part which has a non-trivial drift. It is then shown that the martingale part is zero in the limit as $n \to \infty$, thanks to the nature of the underlying rescaling.

The remainder of the paper is laid out as follows: Section 2 defines the model and states our main results. In Section 3 we prove our results regarding the steady state regime and prove results regarding the properties of the limiting deterministic process $T(t)$. In Section 4 we will prove Theorem 1 regarding the existence, uniqueness and the continuity property of an infinite dimensional stochastic integral equation system governing the behavior of the rescaled process $T^n(t)$. In Section 5 we construct a representation of the system as a combination of martingales and integral terms. Section 6 will establish that these martingales converge to zero. This section will also include the CMT argument and the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 2. Open questions and conjectures are discussed in Section 7.

We close this section with some notational conventions. We use $\Rightarrow$ to denote weak convergence. $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ denotes the set of (non-negative) real values. $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ denotes the set of real values greater than or equal to one. $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ denotes the extended non-negative real line. $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \cup \{\infty\}$ denotes the extended non-negative real line excluding reals strictly less than 1. We equip $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$ with the order topology, in which neighborhoods of ∞ are those sets which contain a subset of the form $\{x > a\}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbb{R}^\infty$ be the space of sequences $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots)$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ and $\rho > 1$ we define the norm

$$||x||_\rho \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sum_{i \geq 0} \rho^{-i} |x_i| ,$$

where $||x||_\rho = \infty$ is a possibility. We also introduce a bounded metric on $\mathbb{R}^\infty$, where for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$ we have

$$\kappa_\rho(x, y) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sum_{i \geq 0} \rho^{-i} \min\left(|x_i - y_i|, 1\right).$$

Note that κ_ρ induces the standard product topology on $\mathbb{R}^\infty$, and we will use $\mathbb{R}^\infty$ with this topology unless noted otherwise. Let $D_t = D([0,t], \mathbb{R})$ be the space of cadlag functions from $[0,t]$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Let $D_t^\infty = D([0,t], \mathbb{R}^\infty)$ be the space of cadlag functions from $[0,t]$ to $\mathbb{R}^\infty$. For $x \in D_t$ we denote the uniform norm

$$||x||_t = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |x(s)|.$$

We also introduce a bounded metric on D_t, where for $x, y \in D_t$ we have

$$\kappa_t(x,y) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \min\left(||x-y||_t, 1\right).$$

Note that κ_t induces the same topology as the uniform norm. For $x \in D_t^\infty$ and $\rho > 1$, we define the ρ-norm by

$$||x||_{\rho,t} = \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} ||x_i||_t,$$

where $||x||_{\rho,t} = \infty$ is a possibility, and a bounded metric on D_t^∞ defined by

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}(x,y) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \kappa_t(x_i, y_i).$$

Observe that $\kappa_{\rho,t}$ induces the standard product topology on D_t^∞. We will use D_t^∞ with this topology unless noted otherwise. For $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $[-\eta,\eta]^\infty = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \text{ s.t. } \forall\ i \geq 0, |x_i| \leq \eta\}$. Let $D_t^\eta = D\left([0,t],[-\eta,\eta]^\infty\right)$ be the space of cadlag functions from $[0,t]$ to $[-\eta,\eta]^\infty$. D_t^η is also equipped with the topology induced by the bounded ρ-metric $\kappa_{\rho,t}$, which is the standard product topology.

2 The model and the main result.

We consider the supermarket model with n exponential rate one servers each with their own queue, and Poisson arrivals with rate $\lambda_n n$ for $\lambda_n < 1$ such that $\lambda_n \uparrow 1$. Specifically, we assume that there exists some sequence η_n and constant $\beta > 0$ such that $\eta_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n(1-\lambda_n) = \beta. \tag{2}$$

We assume $\eta_n \geq 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. Upon arrival customers select $d \geq 2$ queues uniformly at random with replacement and join the shortest of these queues, with ties broken uniformly at random.

Let $0 \leq S_i^n(t) \leq 1$ be the fraction of queues with at least i customers (including the customer in service) at time t. Then the probability that an arriving customer at time t joins a queue of length exactly $i-1$ is

$$(S_{i-1}^n(t))^d - (S_i^n(t))^d.$$

As a result, because the overall arrival rate is $\lambda_n n$, the instantaneous rate of arrivals to queues of length exactly $i-1$ is

$$\lambda_n n \left((S_{i-1}^n(t))^d - (S_i^n(t))^d\right).$$

Note that an arrival to a queue of length $i-1$ increases S_i^n by $1/n$, and all other types of arrivals leave S_i^n unchanged. Similarly, a departure from a queue of length i decreases S_i^n by $1/n$ and any other departures leave S_i^n unchanged. The instantaneous rate of departures from queues of length exactly i at time t is

$$nS_i^n(t) - nS_{i+1}^n(t).$$

For $i \geq 1$ let A_i and D_i be independent rate-1 Poisson processes. Then we can represent the processes S_i^n via random time changes of these Poisson processes. Specifically, we have

$$S_0^n(t) = 1, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_i^n(t) = S_i^n(0) &+ \frac{1}{n} A_i \left(\lambda_n n \int_0^t \left(\left(S_{i-1}^n(s)\right)^d - \left(S_i^n(s)\right)^d \right) ds \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{n} D_i \left(n \int_0^t \left(S_i^n(s) - S_{i+1}^n(s) \right) ds \right), \qquad i \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We let

$$T_i^n = \eta_n (1 - S_i^n),$$

where η_n is defined by (2). Observe that

$$0 \leq T_i^n \leq \eta_n.$$

For technical reasons we restrict our choice of η_n to those for which there exist constants $0 < \xi < 1$ and $Q \geq 0$ such that

$$\eta_n \leq Q n^{1-\xi}, \tag{5}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. That is, we assume $\eta_n = O\left(n^{1-\xi}\right)$. We further define $\eta_\infty = \infty$. We will prove in Theorem 2 that under appropriate conditions, $T^n = (T_0^n, T_1^n, \ldots)$ weakly converges to the solution to a certain integral equation, which we first prove in Theorem 1 has a unique solution.

For every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we let

$$\begin{aligned} g^\eta(x) &\triangleq \frac{\eta}{d} \left(1 - \frac{x}{\eta}\right)^d - \frac{\eta}{d} + x \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{l=2}^{d} \binom{d}{l} (-1)^l \frac{x^l}{\eta^{l-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and also let $g^\infty = 0$ for $\eta = \infty$.

Given $b \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$, $y \in D_t^\infty$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$, consider the following system of integral equations:

$$T_0(t) = 0, \tag{7}$$

$$T_i(t) = b_i + y_i - \lambda d \int_0^t (T_i(s) - T_{i-1}(s) - g^\eta(T_i(s)) + g^\eta(T_{i-1}(s)))\, ds \tag{8}$$
$$+ \int_0^t (T_{i+1}(s) - T_i(s))\, ds, \qquad i \geq 1.$$

An important special case of this system, which will appear as the limiting system in Theorem 2 below, is when we set $\eta = \infty$ and $\lambda = 1$, and $y = 0$. In this case $b_i = T_i(0)$ for $i \geq 1$. This system is as follows:

$$T_0(t) = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$T_i(t) = T_i(0) - d \int_0^t (T_i(s) - T_{i-1}(s))\, ds$$
$$+ \int_0^t (T_{i+1}(s) - T_i(s))\, ds, \qquad i \geq 1. \tag{10}$$

For $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, define

$$c_{\alpha,\xi} = \min\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\xi}{2(1-\xi)}\right). \tag{11}$$

In fact, for our purposes, $\alpha/2$ can be replaced by any number strictly smaller than α. For any $\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$, $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, and $\rho > 1$, let $i^* = c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta$ where $\log_\rho \infty = \infty$. Define a stopping time $t^* \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ as follows:

$$t^* \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf\Big\{ s \geq 0 : \exists\ i \text{ s.t. } 1 \leq i \leq i^* \text{ and } |T_i(s)| \geq \eta^\alpha$$
$$\text{or} \tag{12}$$
$$\exists\ i \text{ s.t. } i > i^* \text{ and } |T_i(s)| \geq \eta + 1 \Big\}.$$

We also define a subset of $\mathbb{R}^\infty$ related to this stopping time. Let

$$\mathcal{Z}^\eta \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \text{ s.t. } \forall\ 1 \leq i \leq i^*, \quad |x_i| \leq \eta^\alpha$$
$$\text{and}$$
$$\forall\ i > i^*, \quad |x_i| \leq \eta + 1 \Big\}.$$

Finally, we define a subset of the product space $\mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$ equipped with the product topology which will allow us to limit our attention to certain parameter values. Specifically, let

$$Z^{\alpha,\xi} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \left\{(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1} \text{ s.t. } b + y(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^\eta\right\}.$$

Observe that for $(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \notin Z^{\alpha,\xi}$, we have $t^* = 0$, and that $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$.

Our first result shows that (7)-(8) has a unique solution on the interval $[0, t^*]$ and that it defines a map which satisfies a certain continuity property.

Theorem 1. *For $t \in [0, t^*]$, the system (7)-(8) has a unique solution $T = (T_i, i \geq 0)$. For any $t \geq 0$, defining*

$$\hat{T}(t) = \begin{cases} T(t) & t < t^* \\ T(t^*) & t \geq t^*, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

we obtain a function $f : \mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1} \to D_t^\infty$ mapping (b, y, λ, η) to $\hat{T} = f(b, y, \lambda, \eta)$. Moreover, when the domain is restricted to $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ equipped with the product topology, f is continuous for every $t \geq 0$.

Remark 1. Note that if $\eta = \infty$ then $t^* = \infty$ and thus $T = \hat{T}$. Further note that for $\eta < \infty$, the definition of t^* implies that in fact either $\hat{T} \in D_t^{\eta+1}$ or $t^* = 0$. In the latter case $\hat{T} = b + y(0)$ is a constant function.

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 4. We now turn to our main result.

Theorem 2. *Suppose λ_n satisfies (2) for a sequence η_n satisfying (5) for some $0 < \xi < 1$ and $Q > 0$. Suppose*

$$T^n(0) \Rightarrow T(0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^\infty \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{14}$$

for some random variable $T(0) \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$. Furthermore, suppose there exists $\rho > 1$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_\rho\right] < \infty, \tag{15}$$

and $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ such that for all sufficiently large n,

$$T_i^n(0) \leq \eta_n^\alpha, \quad 0 \leq i \leq i^*. \tag{16}$$

Then for any $t \geq 0$,

$$T^n \Rightarrow T \quad \text{in } D_t^\infty \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

where T is the unique solution of the system (9)-(10).

The motivation for the initial condition assumptions (15) and (16) is as follows: as we will see below, we expect that in steady state the limiting system T grows like $T_i = d^i$, so condition (15) can be considered as requiring $T^n(0)$ to be consistent with this behavior, with $\rho > d$. Condition (16) is similar, as $d^{i^*} \approx \eta_n^{c_{\alpha,\xi}}$ and $c_{\alpha,\xi} < \alpha$. We prove Theorem 2 in Section 6.

Now we turn to results about the solution T which appears in Theorem 2.

Theorem 3. *Consider the system of integral equations given by* (9)-(10). *This system has a fixed point* $\pi = (\pi_i, i \geq 0)$ *given by*

$$\pi_i = \pi_1 \frac{d^i - 1}{d - 1}. \tag{17}$$

This fixed point is unique up to the constant π_1.

We also show that this fixed point is attractive:

Theorem 4. *Let* $\Phi(t) = \sum_{i \geq 1} d^{-i/2} |T_i(t) - \pi_i|$. *If* $\Phi(0) < \infty$ *then* Φ *converges exponentially fast to zero. Specifically,* $\Phi(t) \leq \Phi(0) e^{-\left(\sqrt{d}-1\right)^2 t}$ *for all* $t \geq 0$.

Finally we consider the system in steady state. Via elementary arguments we prove a bound on the expectation of the fraction of short queues in steady state. For $i \geq 0$, let $S_i^n(\infty)$ be the fraction of queues with length at least i in steady state. For the statement below, we assume λ_n is given by (2) and $\eta_n \to \infty$ is arbitrary. In particular, the assumption (5) is no longer needed.

Theorem 5. *For* $i \geq 0$ *we have*

$$\mathbb{E} S_i^n(\infty) \geq 1 - (1 - \lambda_n) \frac{d^i - 1}{d - 1}. \tag{18}$$

As a result, for any sequence ω_n *which diverges to infinity as* $n \to \infty$, *the fraction of queues with length at least* $\log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$ *approaches unity with probability approaching one as* $n \to \infty$. *This further implies that a customer arriving in steady state experiences a delay of at least* $\log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$ *with probability approaching one as* $n \to \infty$.

We prove Theorems 3-5 in Section 3.

Note that for any sequence ω_n which diverges to infinity as $n \to \infty$, the right hand side of (18) diverges to negative infinity for any $i \geq \log_d \eta_n + \omega_n$. Because (18) is only a lower bound this is not useful, but it does suggest that the behavior of S_i^n is best examined for values of i near $\log_d \eta_n$.

3 The model in steady state.

Proof of Theorem 3. We set the derivative of T_i to zero and and introduce the notation $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots)$ for the desired fixed point. This leads to the recurrence

$$\pi_{i+1} = (d+1)\pi_i - d\pi_{i-1}, \qquad i \geq 1,$$

which is solved by

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{d-1}\left(d\pi_0 - \pi_1 + d^i(\pi_1 - \pi_0)\right), \qquad i \geq 0.$$

By (9) we have $T_0(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and thus $\pi_0 = 0$, so this fixed point reduces to

$$\pi_i = \pi_1 \frac{d^i - 1}{d-1}, \qquad i \geq 0.$$

□

Next we prove Theorem 4:

Proof of Theorem 4. Define $\epsilon_i(t) = T_i(t) - \pi_i$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\epsilon_i}{dt} &= d(\epsilon_{i-1} + \pi_{i-1}) - (d+1)(\epsilon_i + \pi_i) + (\epsilon_{i+1} + \pi_{i+1}) \\ &= d\epsilon_{i-1} - (d+1)\epsilon_i + \epsilon_{i+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Temporarily assume $\epsilon_i \neq 0$ for all i so the derivative $\frac{d\Phi}{dt}$ is well defined. After providing a basic argument under this assumption we will explain how to remove it. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Phi}{dt} = &\sum_{i:\epsilon_i > 0} d^{-i/2}\left(d\epsilon_{i-1} - (d+1)\epsilon_i + \epsilon_{i+1}\right) \\ &- \sum_{i:\epsilon_i < 0} d^{-i/2}\left(d\epsilon_{i-1} - (d+1)\epsilon_i + \epsilon_{i+1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the terms involving ϵ_i. We will first consider $i \geq 2$. There are several cases, depending on the signs of $\epsilon_{i-1}, \epsilon_i$, and ϵ_{i+1}. First suppose they are all negative, so the term involving ϵ_i, which we denote A_i, is

$$\begin{aligned}A_i &= -d^{-(i-1)/2}\epsilon_i + d^{-i/2}(d+1)\epsilon_i - d^{-(i+1)/2}d\epsilon_i \\ &= d^{-i/2}\epsilon_i\left(-\sqrt{d} + d + 1 - \frac{d}{\sqrt{d}}\right) \\ &= \left(1 - 2\sqrt{d} + d\right)d^{-i/2}\epsilon_i.\end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\delta = 1 - 2\sqrt{d} + d = \left(\sqrt{d} - 1\right)^2$$

and note that the assumption $d \geq 2$ implies $\delta > 0$. Now note that if the sign of ϵ_{i-1} or ϵ_{i+1} or both is positive and ϵ_i remains negative this will simply change the sign of the appropriate coefficient of ϵ_i from negative to positive, decreasing A_i. Thus for all cases with ϵ_i negative we have

$$A_i \leq \delta d^{-i/2} \epsilon_i.$$

If all three signs are positive, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= d^{-(i-1)/2}\epsilon_i - d^{-i/2}(d+1)\epsilon_i + d^{-(i+1)/2} d\epsilon_i \\ &= d^{-i/2}\epsilon_i \left(\sqrt{d} - d - 1 + \frac{d}{\sqrt{d}}\right) \\ &= -\delta d^{-i/2}\epsilon_i, \end{aligned}$$

and if ϵ_{i-1} or ϵ_{i+1} is negative we still have

$$A_i \leq -\delta d^{-i/2}\epsilon_i.$$

Thus for all $i \geq 2$ we have

$$A_i \leq -\delta d^{-i/2}|\epsilon_i|.$$

To see that this inequality also holds for $i = 1$ note that for that case we simply omit the first term of A_i. Using this result for all $i \geq 1$ we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi}{dt} &= \sum_{i \geq 1} A_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i \geq 1} -\delta d^{-i/2}|\epsilon_i| \\ &= -\delta\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\Phi(t) \leq \Phi(0)e^{-\delta t},$$

and conclude that $\Phi(t)$ converges exponentially.

As in Mitzenmacher [13], because we are interested in the evolution of the system as time increases, we can account for the $\epsilon_i = 0$ case by considering upper right-hand derivatives of ϵ_i, defining

$$\left.\frac{d|\epsilon_i|}{dt}\right|_{t=t_0} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lim_{t \to t_0^+} \frac{|\epsilon_i(t)|}{t - t_0},$$

and similarly for $\frac{d\Phi}{dt}$. Now if $\epsilon_i(t_0) = 0$ we have $\left.\frac{d|\epsilon_i|}{dt}\right|_{t=t_0} \geq 0$, so we can include the $\epsilon_i = 0$ cases in the above proof with the $\epsilon_i > 0$ case now also including the case with $\epsilon_i = 0$ and $\frac{d\epsilon_i}{dt} \geq 0$ and similarly for $\epsilon_i < 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 5. From (4) we obtain for $i \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}S_i^n(t) = \mathbb{E}S_i^n(0) + \lambda_n \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\left(S_{i-1}^n(s)\right)^d - \left(S_i^n(s)\right)^d\right] ds - \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E}S_i^n(s) - \mathbb{E}S_{i+1}^n(s)\right) ds.$$

Assuming $(S_i^n(0), i \geq 0)$ has a steady state distribution, the same applies to $(S_i^n(t), i \geq 0)$, implying $\mathbb{E}S_i^n(0) = \mathbb{E}S_i^n(t)$. Thus switching to $S_i^n(\infty)$ for steady state version of $S_i^n(t)$, we obtain

$$0 = \lambda_n \mathbb{E}\left[\left(S_{i-1}^n(\infty)\right)^d - \left(S_i^n(\infty)\right)^d\right] - \left(\mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty) - \mathbb{E}S_{i+1}^n(\infty)\right).$$

Because $0 \leq S_i^n(t) \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$ and $S_{i-1}^n(t) \geq S_i^n$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$, we have the bound

$$\left(S_{i-1}^n(\infty)\right)^d - \left(S_i^n(\infty)\right)^d \leq d\left(S_{i-1}^n(\infty) - S_i^n(\infty)\right),$$

and thus have

$$0 \leq \lambda_n d\left(\mathbb{E}S_{i-1}^n(\infty) - \mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty)\right) - \left(\mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty) - \mathbb{E}S_{i+1}^n(\infty)\right).$$

For $i \geq 0$ define

$$\sigma_i \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty) - \mathbb{E}S_{i+1}^n(\infty),$$

and observe that σ_i is the expected number of queues of length exactly i in steady state. We now obtain the bound

$$\sigma_i \leq \lambda_n d \sigma_{i-1}, \qquad i \geq 1,$$

which implies

$$\sigma_i \leq \sigma_0 d^i \left(\lambda_n\right)^i.$$

We have $S_0^n(t) = 1$ and use Little's law to observe $S_1^n(\infty) = \lambda_n$ resulting in

$$\sigma_i \leq (1 - \lambda_n) d^i \lambda_n^i \leq (1 - \lambda_n) d^i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Now observe

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty) &= \mathbb{E}S_0^n(\infty) - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left(\mathbb{E}S_j^n(\infty) - \mathbb{E}S_{j+1}^n(\infty)\right) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sigma_j \\ &\geq 1 - (1-\lambda_n) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} d^j = 1 - (1-\lambda_n)\,\frac{d^i - 1}{d-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This establishes (18).

Recalling (2), for $i \leq \log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}S_i^n(\infty) \geq 1 - (1-\lambda_n)\,\frac{\eta_n d^{-\omega_n} - 1}{d-1} \to 1,$$

as $n \to \infty$. Since $S_i^n(\infty) \leq 1$, this implies that as $n \to \infty$, $S_i^n(\infty) \to 1$ in probability. Namely, the fraction of queues with length at least $\log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$ approaches one in probability.

Finally observe that the probability of an arriving customer in steady state joining a queue of length at least i is $S_i^n(\infty)^d$. For $i \leq \log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$ because we have $S_i^n(\infty)^d \to 1$ in probability, a customer arriving in steady state experiences a delay of at least $\log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$ with probability approaching one as $n \to \infty$. □

Beyond this elementary bound on the expectation in steady state, Theorem 2 suggests that $T^n(\infty)$ converges to π, though formally this is a conjecture because we do not show that the sequence $T^n(\infty)$ is tight. Establishing this interchange of limits would be a potential direction for future work on this system. For the remainder of this section we will suppose the conjecture is true and consider the implications.

First, treating the fixed point (17) as the limit of $T^n(\infty)$, we have

$$\pi_1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n(1 - S_1^n(\infty)).$$

We use Little's law to replace $S_1^n(\infty)$ by λ_n so we have

$$\pi_1 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \eta_n(1 - \lambda_n) = \beta,$$

and therefore the fixed point becomes

$$\pi_i = \beta \frac{d^i - 1}{d-1}, \qquad i \geq 0.$$



Figure 1: Simulated steady state expectation for M/M/n-Sup(d) with $d = 2$ and $\lambda_n = 1 - \beta n^{-\alpha}$ with $\beta = 2$ and $\alpha = 3/4$. For each line the quantity $\alpha \log_d n$ is rounded to the nearest integer. Each horizontal line indicates $\exp(-\beta d^k/(d-1))$, which is the conjectured limit of $\mathbb{E}S^n_{\alpha \log_d n+k}$ as n diverges to infinity.

Recall that $T_i(t) = \eta_n (1 - S_i(t))$, so this fixed point suggests that in steady state the fraction of servers with at least i jobs can be approximated by

$$S_i^n(\infty) \approx 1 - \frac{\beta}{\eta_n} \frac{d^i - 1}{d - 1}$$

when $i = \log_d \eta_n - \omega_n$.

We further conjecture that delay times longer than $\log_d \eta_n + \omega_n$ are unlikely. This is informed by a heuristic analysis of the heavy traffic supermarket model using the fixed $\lambda < 1$ results proved by Mitzenmacher [13] and Vvedenskaya, et. al. [16]. For fixed $\lambda < 1$, the system converges to a limiting system which has a unique fixed point at

$$\pi_i = \lambda^{\frac{d^i - 1}{d-1}}.$$

If we simply replace λ with $\lambda_n = 1 - \frac{\beta}{\eta_n}$, then we have

$$\pi_i = \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\eta_n}\right)^{\frac{d^i-1}{d-1}} \to \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq \log_d \eta_n - \omega_n \\ e^{-\frac{\beta d^k}{d-1}} & i = \log_d \eta_n + k \\ 0 & i \geq \log_d \eta_n + \omega_n, \end{cases}$$

where ω_n is any sequence diverging to infinity and k is any constant. In particular, this heuristic suggests that in steady state all queues will have length $\log_d \eta_n + O(1)$.

As further evidence for this conjectured behavior, we simulated the system for a variety of values of n to estimate the expectation in steady state. Figure 1 shows that the fraction of queues of length at least $i = \log_d \eta_n + k$ remains approximately constant as n increases. Furthermore, these simulated steady state expectations appear to vary around the conjectured limits of $\mathbb{E}S_i^n$ for such i, with the variation primarily introduced by the necessary rounding of i to an integer value.

4 Integral representation.

We prove Theorem 1 in this section. We will make use of a version of Gronwall's inequality, which we state now as a lemma (see, e.g., pg. 498 of [7]).

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $g : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a function such that*

$$0 \leq g(t) \leq \epsilon + M \int_0^t g(s)ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

for some positive finite ϵ and M. Then

$$g(t) \leq \epsilon e^{Mt}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

We begin by establishing two lemmas related to the function g^η.

Lemma 2. *Let $0 < \xi < 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, and $\rho > 1$, and let $c_{\alpha,\xi}$ be defined by (11). Let $\eta^n, \eta \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$ be such that $\eta^n \to \eta$, $i_n^* = c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta^n$, $x_i^n \in D([0,t], [-(\eta^n)^\alpha, (\eta^n)^\alpha])$ for $0 \leq i \leq i_n^*$ and $x_i^n \in D([0,t], [-\eta^n - 1, \eta^n + 1])$ for $i > i_n^*$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^{\eta^n}(x^n), g^\eta(x^n)\right) = 0.$$

Proof. First suppose $\eta < \infty$. Then for large enough n we have $\eta_n < \infty$. For $i \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i - g^{\eta}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t &= \sup_{0\leq s\leq t} \frac{1}{d}\left|\sum_{l=2}^{d}\binom{d}{l}(-1)^l x_i^n(s)^l\left((\eta^n)^{1-l} - \eta^{1-l}\right)\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d}\sum_{l=2}^{d}\binom{d}{l}(\eta^n+1)^l\left|(\eta^n)^{1-l} - \eta^{1-l}\right| \triangleq C_n.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that as $\eta^n \to \eta$, $C_n \to 0$. We can apply this for every $i \geq 0$ to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^{\eta^n}(x^n), g^{\eta}(x^n)\right) &= \sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\min\left(\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i - g^{\eta}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t, 1\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\min\left(C_n, 1\right) \\ &= \frac{\rho}{\rho-1}\min\left(C_n, 1\right).\end{aligned}$$

As $\eta^n \to \eta$ this bound approaches 0, so we have $\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^{\eta^n}(x^n), g^{\eta}(x^n)\right) \to 0$.

Suppose now $\eta = \infty$ and thus $g^\eta = 0$. For $0 \leq i \leq i_n^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i - g^{\eta}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t &= \left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d}\sum_{l=2}^{d}\binom{d}{l}(\eta^n)^{\alpha l}(\eta^n)^{1-l} \\ &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{l=2}^{d}\binom{d}{l}(\eta^n)^{1-l(1-\alpha)}.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^{\eta^n}(x^n), 0\right) &= \sum_{i=0}^{i_n^*}\rho^{-i}\min\left(\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t, 1\right) + \sum_{i>i_n^*}\rho^{-i}\min\left(\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t, 1\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{i_n^*}\rho^{-i}\left|\left|g^{\eta^n}(x^n)_i\right|\right|_t + \sum_{i>i_n^*}\rho^{-i} \\ &\leq \frac{\rho}{d(\rho-1)}\sum_{l=2}^{d}\binom{d}{l}(\eta^n)^{1-l(1-\alpha)} + \frac{\rho^{-i_n^*}}{\rho-1}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\eta^n \to \infty$ we have $i_n^* \to \infty$ and thus $\rho^{-i_n^*} \to 0$. For $2 \leq l \leq d$ we have

$$(\eta^n)^{1-l(1-\alpha)} \to 0,$$

and thus the first term approaches zero. Thus again we have $\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^{\eta^n}(x^n), g^{\eta}(x^n)\right) \to 0$. □

Lemma 3. *For every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, g^η is a Lipschitz continuous function on $D_t^{\eta+2}$ with constant 4^d. That is, for $x^1, x^2 \in D_t^{\eta+2}$, and for $i \geq 0$,*

$$\kappa_t\left(g^\eta(x_i^1), g^\eta(x_i^2)\right) \leq 4^d \kappa_t\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right)$$

and

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^\eta(x^1), g^\eta(x^2)\right) \leq 4^d \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1, x^2\right).$$

Proof. Consider the restriction of g^η onto $[-\eta-2, \eta+2] \to \mathbb{R}$. This function is differentiable and thus is Lipschitz continuous with constant

$$\sup_{y \in [-\eta-2,\eta+2]} |\dot{g}^\eta(y)| = \sup_{y \in [-\eta-2,\eta+2]} \left| -\left(1 - \frac{y}{\eta}\right)^{d-1} + 1 \right| \leq 4^d.$$

Thus for $y^1, y^2 \in [-\eta-2, \eta+2]$ we have $|g^\eta(y^1) - g^\eta(y^2)| \leq 4^d |y^1 - y^2|$, which further implies for $x^1, x^2 \in D_t^{\eta+2}$ and for $i \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_t\left(g^\eta(x_i^1), g^\eta(x_i^2)\right) &= \min\left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |g^\eta(x_i^1(s)) - g^\eta(x_i^2(s))|, 1\right) \\
&\leq \min\left(4^d \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |x_i^1(s) - x_i^2(s)|, 1\right) \\
&\leq 4^d \min\left(\left|\left|x_i^1 - x_i^2\right|\right|_t, 1\right) \\
&= 4^d \kappa_t\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This further implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^\eta(x^1), g^\eta(x^2)\right) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} \rho^{-i} \kappa_t\left(g^\eta(x_i^1), g^\eta(x_i^2)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \geq 0} \rho^{-i} 4^d \kappa_t\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right) \\
&= 4^d \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1, x^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1: Existence and uniqueness. Fix $(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1}$.

Suppose first $T(0) = b + y(0) \notin \mathcal{Z}^\eta$. Then $t^* = 0$ and $\hat{T}(t) = T(0)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We now suppose $T(0) = b + y(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^\eta$, and therefore for all $1 \leq i \leq i^*$ we have $|T_i(0)| \leq \eta^\alpha$ and for all $i > i^*$ we have $|T_i(0)| \leq \eta + 1$. We will show existence and uniqueness via a contraction mapping argument, showing that the map defined by the right hand side of (7)-(8) is a contraction for small enough t. We first define the map $\Gamma : D_t^\infty \to D_t^\infty$, where for $x \in D_t^\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma(x)_0(t) = 0, \\
&\Gamma(x)_i(t) = b_i + y_i(t) - \lambda d \int_0^t \left(x_i(s) - x_{i-1}(s) - g^\eta(x_i) + g^\eta(x_{i-1})\right) ds \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_0^t \left(x_{i+1}(s) - x_i(s)\right) ds, \qquad i \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$\begin{aligned}
t^* \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \inf \Big\{ s \geq 0 : &\exists\ i \text{ s.t. } 1 \leq i \leq i^* \text{ and } |\Gamma(x)_i(s)| \geq \eta^\alpha \\
&\text{or} \\
&\exists\ i \text{ s.t. } i > i^* \text{ and } |\Gamma(x)_i(s)| \geq \eta + 1 \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

and further define $\hat{\Gamma} : D_t^\infty \to D_t^\infty$ by

$$\hat{\Gamma}(x)_i(t) = \begin{cases} \Gamma(x)_i(t) & t < t^* \\ \Gamma(x)_i(t^*) & t \geq t^*, \end{cases}$$

for all $i \geq 0$.

By construction, $\hat{\Gamma}(x)_i(t) \in [-\eta - 1, \eta + 1]$ for all $i \geq 0$, and thus $\hat{\Gamma} : D_t^\infty \to D_t^{\eta+1}$.

We now show that for

$$t_0 < \frac{1}{\lambda d(1 + \rho^{-1})(1 + 4^d) + 1 + \rho},$$

$\hat{\Gamma}$ is a contraction on $D_t^{\eta+1}$ for all $t \leq t_0$. Namely, we claim that there exists $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $t \in [0, t_0]$ and $x^1, x^2 \in D_t^{\eta+1}$, we have

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1), \hat{\Gamma}(x^2)\right) \leq \gamma \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1, x^2\right). \tag{19}$$

Let $t \leq t_0$ and $x^1, x^2 \in D_t^{\eta+1}$. We have for $i \geq 1$

$$\kappa_t\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1)_i, \hat{\Gamma}(x^2)_i\right) \leq \min\Bigg(1, \lambda d \int_0^t \Bigg(\left|\left|x_i^1 - x_i^2\right|\right|_s + \left|\left|x_{i-1}^1 - x_{i-1}^2\right|\right|_s + \left|\left|g^\eta(x_i^1) - g^\eta(x_i^2)\right|\right|_s + \left|\left|g^\eta(x_{i-1}^1) - g^\eta(x_{i-1}^2)\right|\right|_s \Bigg) ds + \int_0^t \left(\left|\left|x_{i+1}^1 - x_{i+1}^2\right|\right|_s + \left|\left|x_i^1 - x_i^2\right|\right|_s\right) ds \Bigg).$$

Observe, for $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the simple identity

$$\min\left(\sum_{i=1}^k z_i, 1\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \min\left(z_i, 1\right). \tag{20}$$

To verify this identity, observe first that if there is some $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $z_j \geq 1$ then the right hand side is at least 1, while the left hand side is at most 1. If instead $z_i < 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ then

$$\min\left(\sum_{i=1}^k z_i, 1\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k z_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \min\left(z_i, 1\right).$$

Using (20), we obtain

$$\kappa_t\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1)_i, \hat{\Gamma}(x^2)_i\right) \leq \lambda d \int_0^t \Bigg(\kappa_s\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right) + \kappa_s\left(x_{i-1}^1, x_{i-1}^2\right) + \kappa_s\left(g^\eta(x_i^1), g^\eta(x_i^2)\right) + \kappa_s\left(g^\eta(x_{i-1}^1), g^\eta(x_{i-1}^2)\right) \Bigg) ds + \int_0^t \left(\kappa_s\left(x_{i+1}^1, x_{i+1}^2\right) + \kappa_s\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right)\right) ds.$$

By Lemma 3, for $\eta < \infty$, g^η is Lipschitz when restricted to $D_t^{\eta+2}$, with constant 4^d. For $\eta = \infty$, $g^\infty = 0$. Thus we now have

$$\kappa_t\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1)_i, \hat{\Gamma}(x^2)_i\right) \leq t\lambda d(1+4^d)\kappa_t\left(x_{i-1}^1, x_{i-1}^2\right) + t\left(\lambda d(1+4^d)+1\right)\kappa_t\left(x_i^1, x_i^2\right) + t\kappa_t\left(x_{i+1}^1, x_{i+1}^2\right).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1),\hat{\Gamma}(x^2)\right) \leq\ & t\lambda d(1+4^d)\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i-1},x^2_{i-1}\right)\\ &+ t\left(\lambda d(1+4^d)+1\right)\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right)\\ &+ t\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i+1},x^2_{i+1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We bound each of these sums individually. Observe

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i-1},x^2_{i-1}\right) &= \rho^{-1}\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-(i-1)}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i-1},x^2_{i-1}\right)\\ &= \rho^{-1}\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right)\\ &= \rho^{-1}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1,x^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right) \leq \sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right) = \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1,x^2\right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i+1},x^2_{i+1}\right) &= \rho\sum_{i\geq 1}\rho^{-(i+1)}\kappa_t\left(x^1_{i+1},x^2_{i+1}\right)\\ &= \rho\sum_{i\geq 2}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right)\\ &\leq \rho\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\kappa_t\left(x^1_i,x^2_i\right)\\ &= \rho\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1,x^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Combining these bounds we have

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(\hat{\Gamma}(x^1),\hat{\Gamma}(x^2)\right) \leq t\left(\lambda d(1+\rho^{-1})(1+4^d)+1+\rho\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^1,x^2\right).$$

Let

$$t_0 < \frac{1}{\lambda d(1+\rho^{-1})(1+4^d)+1+\rho}.$$

Then (19) holds with

$$\gamma = t_0\left(\lambda d(1+\rho^{-1})(1+4^d)+1+\rho\right).$$

By the contraction mapping principle, $\hat{\Gamma}$ has a unique fixed point $\hat{T}$ on $D_t^{\eta+1}$ such that $\hat{\Gamma}(\hat{T}) = \hat{T}$. This fixed point provides a unique solution $\hat{T}$ to (13) for $t \in [0, t_0]$.

Suppose this fixed solution $\hat{T}$ is such that $t^* < t_0$. Then $\hat{T}$ is uniquely defined for all $t \geq 0$ and the proof is complete. Otherwise, observe for $t \geq 0$ and $i \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_i(t) = T_i(t_0) + y_i(t) - y_i(t_0) \\ - \lambda d \int_{t_0}^{t} (T_i(s) - T_{i-1}(s) - g^\eta(T_i(s)) + g^\eta(T_{i-1}(s)))\, ds \\ + \int_{t_0}^{t} (T_{i+1}(s) - T_i(s))\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we define a shifted version of y by $\tilde{y}(u) = y(u + t_0)$, then $T_i(t)$ for $t = u + t_0$ and $u \geq 0$ is the solution to the system

$$\begin{aligned} x_0(u) &= 0 \\ x_i(u) &= T_i(t_0) - y_i(t_0) + \tilde{y}_i(u) \\ &\quad - \lambda d \int_0^u (x_i(s) - x_{i-1}(s) - g^\eta(x_i(s)) + g^\eta(x_{i-1}(s)))\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^u (x_{i+1}(s) - x_i(s))\, ds, \quad i \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that this is the system (7)-(8) with arguments

$$(T(t_0) - y(t_0), \tilde{y}, \lambda, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^\infty \times D_t^\infty \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 1},$$

and furthermore $x(0) = T(t_0) - y(t_0) + \tilde{y}(0) = T(t_0)$ and $T(t_0) \in \mathcal{Z}^\eta$ because $t^* \geq t_0$. Thus we can repeat the contraction argument above to find a unique solution x for $u \in [0, t_0]$. This unique x is the unique solution $\hat{T}$ for $t \in [t_0, 2t_0]$. If $t^* < 2t_0$, then $\hat{T}$ is uniquely defined for all $t \geq 0$ and the proof is complete. Otherwise, the above extension argument can be repeated to find a unique solution $\hat{T}$ for $[2t_0, 3t_0], [3t_0, 4t_0], \ldots$. If $t^* < kt_0$ for some $k \geq 3$ then the argument stops there and we conclude $\hat{T}$ is uniquely defined for all $t \geq 0$. Otherwise it may be extended to any $t \geq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 2: continuity. We now prove continuity for f restricted to the domain $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$. Suppose $(b^n, y^n, \lambda^n, \eta^n) \to (b, y, \lambda, \eta)$, with $(b^n, y^n, \lambda^n, \eta^n) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ and since the set $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ is closed, we also have $(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$. Suppose x^n is the unique solution to (13) for $(b^n, y^n, \lambda^n, \eta^n)$ and x is the unique

solution for (b, y, λ, η). Let $i_n^* = c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta_n$ and $i^* = c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta$. Let t_n^* and t^* be the stopping times for x^n and x, respectively.

Recall that by the definition of $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$, we have $x^n(0) = b^n + y^n(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^{\eta^n}$. Note that this, along with the definition of t_n^*, implies that $x^n(t) \in \mathcal{Z}^{\eta^n}$ for any $t \geq 0$. Similarly, we have $x(t) \in \mathcal{Z}^{\eta}$ for any $t \geq 0$. We adopt the simplified notation $g^n \triangleq g^{\eta^n}$ and $g = g^{\eta}$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n, x\right) &= \sum_{i\geq 1} \rho^{-i} \kappa_t\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i\geq 1} \rho^{-i} \min\Bigg(1, |b_i^n - b_i| + ||y_i^n - y_i||_t \\
&\quad + \lambda_n d \int_0^t \big(\left|\left|x_{i-1}^n - x_{i-1}\right|\right|_s + ||x_i^n - x_i||_s \\
&\quad + \left|\left|g^n(x_{i-1}^n - g(x_{i-1})\right|\right|_s + ||g^n(x_i^n) - g(x_i)||_s \big) ds \\
&\quad + |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \int_0^t \big(||x_{i-1}||_s + ||x_i||_s \\
&\quad + ||g(x_{i-1})||_s + ||g(x_i)||_s \big) ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \left(||x_i^n - x_i||_s + \left|\left|x_{i+1}^n - x_{i+1}\right|\right|_s\right) ds\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the simple identity (20), with which we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n, x\right) \leq\ & \kappa_\rho\left(b^n, b\right) + \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n, y\right) + \\
&+ \lambda_n d \sum_{i\geq 1} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \Big(\kappa_s\left(x_{i-1}^n, x_{i-1}\right) + \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) \\
&\quad + \kappa_s\left(g^n(x_{i-1}^n), g(x_{i-1})\right) + \kappa_s\left(g^n(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right) \Big) ds \\
&+ |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \sum_{i\geq 1} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \Big(\kappa_s\left(x_{i-1}, 0\right) + \kappa_s\left(x_i, 0\right) \\
&\quad + \kappa_s\left(g(x_{i-1}), 0\right) + \kappa_s\left(g(x_i), 0\right) \Big) ds \\
&+ \sum_{i\geq 1} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(\kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) + \kappa_s\left(x_{i+1}^n, x_{i+1}\right)\right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

We rearrange terms in the sums to write this bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n,x\right) \leq \kappa_\rho\left(b^n,b\right) + \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n,y\right) + \\ + \lambda_n d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\ + \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t (\rho+1) \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\ + |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(x_i, 0\right) ds \\ + |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(g(x_i), 0\right) ds \\ + \lambda_n d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(g^n(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right) ds.\end{aligned}$$

Now observe the bound

$$\kappa_s\left(g^n(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right) \leq \kappa_s\left(g^n(x_i^n), g(x_i^n)\right) + \kappa_s\left(g(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right),$$

which we apply to the last term above. With some rearranging of terms we now have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n,x\right) \leq \kappa_\rho\left(b^n,b\right) + \kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n,y\right) + \\ + \left(\lambda_n d \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) + \rho + 1\right) \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\ + \lambda_n d \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \kappa_s\left(g(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right) ds \\ + |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(x_i, 0\right) ds \\ + |\lambda - \lambda_n| d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(g(x_i), 0\right) ds \\ + \lambda_n d \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \kappa_s\left(g^n(x_i^n), g(x_i^n)\right) ds.\end{aligned}$$

Because the last three sums do not involve the distance $\kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right)$, we will crudely upper bound the integrals in those terms. Terms which do involve

this distance will be preserved as integrals so we can later apply Gronwall's inequality (Lemma 1). Thus we now have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n,x\right) \leq\ & \kappa_\rho\left(b^n,b\right)+\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n,y\right)+\\ &+\left(\lambda_n d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)+\rho+1\right)\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\int_0^t \kappa_s\left(x_i^n,x_i\right)ds\\ &+\lambda_n d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\int_0^t \kappa_s\left(g(x_i^n),g(x_i)\right)ds\\ &+|\lambda-\lambda_n|dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x,0\right)\\ &+|\lambda-\lambda_n|dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g(x),0\right)\\ &+\lambda_n dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^n(x^n),g(x^n)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $x\in D_t^{\eta+1}\subset D_t^{\eta+2}$ and by Lemma 3 g is Lipschitz with constant 4^d when restricted to $D_t^{\eta+2}$. If $\eta=\infty$ recall $g=0$. Thus we have the bound

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g(x),0\right)\leq 4^d\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x,0\right),$$

which we apply to get the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n,x\right)\leq\ & \kappa_\rho\left(b^n,b\right)+\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n,y\right)+|\lambda-\lambda_n|dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x,0\right)\\ &+\lambda_n dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^n(x^n),g(x^n)\right)\\ &+\left(\lambda_n d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)+\rho+1\right)\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\int_0^t \kappa_s\left(x_i^n,x_i\right)ds\\ &+\lambda_n d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\sum_{i\geq 0}\rho^{-i}\int_0^t \kappa_s\left(g(x_i^n),g(x_i)\right)ds.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that for any $t\geq 0$ we have $x^n(t)\in\mathcal{Z}^{\eta^n}$ and thus $|x_i^n(t)|\leq(\eta^n)^\alpha$ for $i\leq i_n^*$, and $|x_i^n(t)|\leq\eta^n+1$ for $i>i_n^*$, so the conditions of Lemma 2 are satisfied and therefore we have $\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^n(x^n),g(x^n)\right)\to 0$. Thus given any $\delta>0$ we can now choose N such that for $n\geq N$ we have

$$\lambda_n\leq\lambda+1,$$

$$\eta^n\leq\eta+1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\kappa_\rho\left(b^n,b\right)+\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(y^n,y\right)\\ &\quad+|\lambda-\lambda_n|dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x,0\right)\\ &\quad+\lambda_n dt\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(g^n(x^n),g(x^n)\right)\quad<\delta.\end{aligned}$$

The $\eta^n \leq \eta + 1$ requirement allows us to guarantee $x^n \in D_t^{\eta+2}$, so we can apply Lemma 3 to conclude

$$\kappa_s\left(g(x_i^n), g(x_i)\right) \leq 4^d \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right),$$

for any $i \geq 0$. Recall that if $\eta = \infty$ then $g = 0$. We now have, for all sufficiently large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n, x\right) &\leq \delta + \left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) + \rho + 1\right) \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\
&\quad + (\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right) \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t 4^d \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\
&= \delta + \left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right) + \rho + 1\right) \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \int_0^t \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\
&= \delta + \left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right) + \rho + 1\right) \int_0^t \sum_{i\geq 0} \rho^{-i} \kappa_s\left(x_i^n, x_i\right) ds \\
&= \delta + \left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right) + \rho + 1\right) \int_0^t \kappa_{\rho,s}\left(x^n, x\right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Gronwall's inequality to conclude

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n, x\right) \leq \delta e^{\left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right)+\rho+1\right)t}.$$

Thus for

$$\delta < \epsilon e^{-\left((\lambda+1)d\left(1+\rho^{-1}\right)\left(1+4^d\right)+\rho+1\right)t},$$

we have

$$\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(x^n, x\right) < \epsilon,$$

proving continuity for every $t \geq 0$. □

5 Martingale representation.

We now show that the stochastic process underlying the supermarket system stopped at some appropriate time can be written in a form that exactly matches that of $\hat{T}$ in (13). This will allow us to use Theorem 1 and the continuous mapping theorem to prove Theorem 2 in the next section.

Before introducing the stopped variant, we will consider the original supermarket system and show that it can be represented by the equations (7)-(8) for a particular choice of arguments (b, y, λ, η).

For $i \geq 1$, recall the representation (4). Given the definition $T_i^n = \eta_n (1 - S_i^n)$ we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_i^n(t) &= T_i^n(0) - \frac{\eta_n}{n} A_i \left(\lambda_n n \int_0^t \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n} T_{i-1}^n(s)\right)^d - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n} T_i^n(s)\right)^d \right) ds \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_n}{n} D_i \left(n \int_0^t \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n} T_i^n(s)\right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta_n} T_{i+1}^n(s)\right) \right) ds \right) \\
&= T_i^n(0) - \frac{\eta_n}{n} A_i \Bigg(\lambda_n n \int_0^t \Bigg(\left(1 - \frac{d}{\eta_n} T_{i-1}^n(s) + \frac{d}{\eta_n} g^{\eta_n}(T_{i-1}^n(s))\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad - \left(1 - \frac{d}{\eta_n} T_i^n(s) + \frac{d}{\eta_n} g^{\eta_n}(T_i^n(s))\right) \Bigg) ds \Bigg) \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_n}{n} D_i \left(\frac{n}{\eta_n} \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s) \right) ds \right) \\
&= T_i^n(0) - \frac{\eta_n}{n} A_i \left(\lambda_n d \frac{n}{\eta_n} \int_0^t \left(T_i^n(s) - T_{i-1}^n(s) - g^{\eta_n}(T_i^n(s)) + g^{\eta_n}(T_{i-1}^n(s)) \right) ds \right) + \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_n}{n} D_i \left(\frac{n}{\eta_n} \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s) \right) ds \right), \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

where g^{η_n} is defined as in (6). We now define scaled martingale processes

$$\begin{aligned}
M_i^n(t) &= \frac{\eta_n}{n} A_i \left(\lambda_n d \frac{n}{\eta_n} \int_0^t \left(T_i^n(s) - T_{i-1}^n(s) + g^{\eta_n}(T_i^n(s)) - g^{\eta_n}(T_{i-1}^n(s)) \right) ds \right) \\
&\quad - \lambda_n d \int_0^t \left(T_i^n(s) - T_{i-1}^n(s) + g^{\eta_n}(T_i^n(s)) - g^{\eta_n}(T_{i-1}^n(s)) \right) ds, \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

$$N_i^n(t) = \frac{\eta_n}{n} D_i \left(\frac{n}{\eta_n} \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s) \right) ds \right) - \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s) \right) ds. \qquad (23)$$

Now we can rewrite the system for $i \geq 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_i^n(t) &= T_i^n(0) - M_i^n(t) - \lambda_n d \int_0^t \left(T_i^n(s) - T_{i-1}^n(s) + g^{\eta_n}(T_i^n(s)) - g^{\eta_n}(T_{i-1}^n(s)) \right) ds \\
&\quad + N_i^n(t) + \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s) \right) ds. \qquad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

This representation matches (8) with $b = T^n(0)$, $y = -M^n + N^n$, $\lambda = \lambda_n$ and $\eta = \eta_n$.

Recall that the assumptions of Theorem 2 include constants $\rho > 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, and $0 < \xi < 1$, and recall $c_{\alpha,\xi}$ defined by (11). We now define $i_n^* = c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta_n$ and define a stopping time

$$t_n^* = \inf \{t \geq 0 : \exists\ i \text{ s.t. } 1 \leq i \leq i_n^* \text{ and } T_i^n(t) \geq \eta_n^\alpha\}.$$

Note that compared to (12), this stopping time does not contain terms checking $T_i^n(t) \leq -(\eta_n)^\alpha$, or $|T_i^n(t)| \geq \eta_n + 1$. This is because $0 \leq T_i^n(t) \leq \eta_n$ for all $i \geq 0$ and for all $t \geq 0$, so such conditions are never met. Thus t_n^* is equivalent to the stopping time defined by (12). We consider the process $\hat{T}^n$ defined by

$$\hat{T}_i^n(t) = \begin{cases} T_i^n(t) & t < t_n^* \\ T_i^n(t_n^*) & t \geq t_n^*. \end{cases}$$

As noted above, the stopped supermarket model $\hat{T}^n$ is the unique solution of the integral equation system (13) described in Theorem 1, with arguments $b = T^n(0)$, $y = -M^n + N^n$, $\lambda = \lambda_n$, and $\eta = \eta_n$. Finally, observe that $y(0) = 0$ and $0 \leq T_i^n(0) \leq \eta_n$ for all $i \geq 0$. Thus assumption (16) implies that for all sufficiently large n, $T^n(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^{\eta_n}$ and thus $(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ for such n.

6 Martingale convergence.

Because our sequence of supermarket models indexed by n are all examples of the integral equation system (13), and Theorem 1 shows that this system defines a continuous map from the arguments $(b, y, \lambda, \eta) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ to the stopped system $f(b, y, \lambda, \eta) = \hat{T}$, we can find the weak limit of the finite system $\hat{T}^n$ by the continuous mapping theorem. Specifically, because $(T^n(0), -M^n + N^n, \lambda_n, \eta_n) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$, if $T^n(0) \Rightarrow b^\infty$, $-M^n + N^n \Rightarrow y^\infty$, $\lambda_n \Rightarrow \lambda^\infty$, $\eta_n \Rightarrow \eta^\infty$, then $(b^\infty, y^\infty, \lambda^\infty, \eta^\infty) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ because $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$ is a closed set. The continuous mapping theorem states that because $\hat{T}^n = f(T^n(0), -M^n + N^n, \lambda_n, \eta_n)$ and f is continuous on $Z^{\alpha,\xi}$, then if $T = f(b^\infty, y^\infty, \lambda^\infty, \eta^\infty)$, we have $\hat{T}^n \Rightarrow T$. Thus to find the weak limit T we only need to find the limits $(b^\infty, y^\infty, \lambda^\infty, \eta^\infty)$.

Three of these limits are given, as (14) provides $\hat{T}^n(0) \Rightarrow T(0)$, and we have $\lambda_n \to 1$ and $\eta_n \to \infty$. We claim $-M^n + N^n \Rightarrow 0$. We now prove the following:

Proposition 1. *For M^n and N^n as defined in* (22)-(23)*, if the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold, then*

$$M^n, N^n \Rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } D_t^\infty \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Before proving this proposition, we prove a bound on the unbounded ρ-norm of T^n in expectation.

Lemma 4. *For any $\gamma > 1$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\gamma,t}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_{\gamma}\right] e^{\gamma t}. \tag{25}$$

Proof. By dropping negative terms from (21) we have

$$T_i^n(t) \leq T_i^n(0) + \frac{\eta_n}{n} D_i\left(\frac{n}{\eta_n}\int_0^t T_{i+1}^n(s)ds\right).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[||T_i^n||_t\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}T_i^n(0) + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t T_{i+1}^n(s)ds\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}T_i^n(0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\left|T_{i+1}^n\right|\right|_s\right] ds.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\gamma,t}\right] &= \sum_{i\geq 1}\gamma^{-i}\mathbb{E}\left[||T_i^n||_t\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_{\gamma}\right] + \sum_{i\geq 1}\gamma^{-i}\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\left|T_{i+1}^n\right|\right|_s\right] ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_{\gamma}\right] + \gamma\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\gamma,s}\right] ds.\end{aligned}$$

We can now apply Lemma 1 to conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\gamma,t}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_{\gamma}\right] e^{\gamma t},$$

as desired. □

Proof of Proposition 1. We first prove the statement for N^n. We begin with some observations about N^n and introduce some additional definitions. Let

$$\tau_i^n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \int_0^t \left(T_{i+1}^n(s) - T_i^n(s)\right) ds, \quad i \geq 0. \tag{26}$$

Observe for all $i \geq 0$

$$\tau_i^n \leq t\left|\left|T_{i+1}^n\right|\right|_t. \tag{27}$$

Now observe

$$
\begin{aligned}
||N_i^n||_t &= \sup_{0\le u\le t}\left|\frac{\eta_n}{n}D_i\left(\frac{n}{\eta_n}\int_0^u\left(T_{i+1}^n(s)-T_i^n(s)\right)ds\right)-\int_0^u\left(T_{i+1}^n(s)-T_i^n(s)\right)ds\right| \\
&= \sup_{0\le s\le \tau_i^n}\left|\frac{\eta_n}{n}D_i\left(\frac{n}{\eta_n}s\right)-s\right| \\
&= \sup_{0\le u\le \frac{n\tau_i^n}{\eta_n}}\frac{\eta_n}{n}\left|D_i(u)-u\right|. \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}
$$

We claim

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{1\le i\le i_n^*}\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\right]=0. \qquad (29)$$

By Lemma 4 with $\gamma=\rho$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\rho,t}\right]\le\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_\rho\right]e^{\rho t}.$$

Recall (15), fix some $\epsilon>0$ and let

$$C=\left(\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n(0)||_\rho\right]+\epsilon\right)e^{\rho t}.$$

For all sufficiently large n we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\rho,t}\right]\le C.$$

This further implies that for all $1\le i\le i_n^*+1$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||T_i^n||_t\right]\le C\rho^i\le C\rho^{i_n^*+1}.$$

Define

$$\delta_n=\frac{1}{\left(\log_\rho\eta_n\right)^2},$$

and define the event

$$A=\left\{\exists\ i\le i_n^*+1\text{ s.t. }\ ||T_i^n||_t\ge\frac{1}{\delta_n}C\rho^{i_n^*+1}\right\}.$$

By Markov's inequality and the union bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(A\right)\le\delta_n(i_n^*+1)=\frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{\log_\rho\eta_n}+\frac{1}{\left(\log_\rho\eta_n\right)^2}. \qquad (30)$$

Observe

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\mathbb{1}\{A\}\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\mathbb{1}\{A^c\}\right]. \tag{31}$$

We will bound these two terms separately. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\leq 1$, and (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\mathbb{1}\{A\}\right] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\right)^2\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(A)}\\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{\log_\rho \eta_n}+\frac{1}{\left(\log_\rho \eta_n\right)^2}}. \end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

As $n\to\infty$ this bound goes to zero.

We now consider the second term of (31). Recall (28) and observe

$$\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\mathbb{1}\{A^c\}\leq \sup_{0\leq u\leq \frac{n\tau_i^n}{\eta_n}}\frac{\eta_n}{n}\left|D_i(u)-u\right|. \tag{33}$$

For $0\leq i\leq i_n^*$, A^c and (27) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i^n &\leq \frac{t}{\delta_n}C\rho^{i_n^*+1}\\ &= t\rho C\frac{\eta_n^{c_{\alpha,\xi}}}{\delta_n}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying this for (33) we obtain

$$\kappa_t\left(N_i^n,0\right)\mathbb{1}\{A^c\}\leq \sup\frac{\eta_n}{n}\left|D_i(u)-u\right|,$$

where the supremum is over

$$0\leq u\leq t\rho C n\delta_n^{-1}\eta_n^{c_{\alpha,\xi}-1}.$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_n &\stackrel{\triangle}{=} n\delta_n^{-1}\eta_n^{c_{\alpha,\xi}-1}\\ &= \frac{n}{\eta_n^{1-c_{\alpha,\xi}}}\left(\log_\rho \eta_n\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\eta_n=O\left(n^{1-\xi}\right)$, so

$$\eta_n^{1-c_{\alpha,\xi}}=O\left(n^{(1-\xi)(1-c_{\alpha,\xi})}\right),$$

and $(1-\xi)(1-c_{\alpha,\xi}) < 1$, so $\nu_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right) \mathbb{1}\{A^c\} &\leq \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t\rho C\nu_n} \frac{\eta_n}{n} \left|D_i(u) - u\right| \\ &= \frac{\eta_n\sqrt{\nu_n}}{n} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t\rho C\nu_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_n}} \left|D_i(u) - u\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\gamma_n \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{\eta_n\sqrt{\nu_n}}{n}\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t\rho C\nu_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_n}} \left|D_i(u) - u\right|.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right) \mathbb{1}\{A^c\}\right] \leq \gamma_n$ for $1 \leq i \leq i_n^*$. By the Functional Central Limit Theorem (FCLT), since $\nu_n \to \infty$ we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t\rho C\nu_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_n}} \left|D_i(u) - u\right| \Rightarrow \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t\rho C} |B(u)|,$$

where B is a standard Brownian motion. Furthermore, observe that

$$\frac{\eta_n\sqrt{\nu_n}}{n} = n^{-1/2}\eta_n^{1/2+c_{\alpha,\xi}/2} \log_\rho \eta_n.$$

By assumption we have $\eta_n = O\left(n^{1-\xi}\right)$, so

$$\eta_n^{1/2+c_{\alpha,\xi}/2} = O\left(n^{(1-\xi)(1/2+c_{\alpha,\xi}/2)}\right).$$

Recall that by (11) we have

$$\frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{2} \leq \frac{\xi}{4(1-\xi)}.$$

Then

$$(1-\xi)\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{2}\right) \leq (1-\xi)\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\xi}{4(1-\xi)}\right) = \frac{2-\xi}{4} < \frac{1}{2},$$

which implies

$$\frac{\eta_n\sqrt{\nu_n}}{n} \to 0,$$

and thus $\gamma_n \to 0$.

Returning to (31) and recalling (32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right) \mathbb{1}\{A\}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right) \mathbb{1}\{A^c\}\right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{\log_\rho \eta_n} + \frac{1}{\left(\log_\rho \eta_n\right)^2}} + \gamma_n,\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{1\le i\le i_n^*} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{\frac{c_{\alpha,\xi}}{\log_\rho \eta_n} + \frac{1}{\left(\log_\rho \eta_n\right)^2}} + \gamma_n = 0,$$

which establishes the claim (29).

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_{\rho,t}\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] &= \sum_{i\ge 1} \rho^{-i} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] \\
&\le \max_{1\le i\le i_n^*} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] \sum_{1\le i\le i_n^*} \rho^{-i} + \sum_{i>i_n^*} \rho^{-i} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] \\
&\le \frac{\rho}{\rho - 1} \max_{1\le i\le i_n^*} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] + \sum_{i>i_n^*} \rho^{-i} \\
&= \frac{\rho}{\rho - 1} \max_{1\le i\le i_n^*} \mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] + \frac{\rho^{-i_n^*}}{\rho - 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $i_n^* \to \infty$ implies the second term goes to zero. Recalling (29), we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(N_i^n, 0\right)\right] \to 0.$$

The argument to show $\mathbb{E}\left[\kappa_t\left(M_i^n, 0\right)\right] \to 0$ is similar: we redefine τ_i^n as

$$\tau_i^n = \lambda_n d \int_0^t \left(T_i^n(s) - T_{i-1}^n(s) + g^n(T_i^n(s)) - g^n(T_{i-1}^n(s))\right) ds.$$

By Lemma 3, g^{η_n} restricted to $D_t^{\eta_n+2}$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant 4^d and that $\lambda_n \uparrow 1$, so we have the bound

$$\tau_n^i \le td(1+4^d)\left|\left|T_i^n\right|\right|_t + td4^d \left|\left|T_{i-1}^n\right|\right|_t.$$

This bound replaces (27) and the rest of the argument proceeds essentially identically to the N^n case. □

We are now prepared to prove our main result:

Proof of Theorem 2. We first claim $\hat{T}^n \Rightarrow T$. We established in Section 5 that $\hat{T}^n = f(T^n(0), -M^n + N^n, \lambda_n, \eta_n)$ where f is the function defined in Theorem 1. In Proposition 1 we established $-M^n + N^n \Rightarrow 0$. By assumption (16), for sufficiently large n we have $(T^n(0), -M^n + N^n, \lambda_n, \eta_n) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$, and clearly $(T(0), 0, 1, \infty) \in Z^{\alpha,\xi}$. Thus by the continuous mapping part of Theorem 1 we have

$$\hat{T}^n \Rightarrow f(T(0), 0, 1, \infty).$$

By definition, we have $f(T(0), 0, 1, \infty) = T$. Thus we conclude

$$\hat{T}^n \Rightarrow T.$$

By construction, $\hat{T}^n(t)$ and $T^n(t)$ are identical for $t \in [0, t_n^*]$. Thus it remains to show that for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}(t_n^* \leq t) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let

$$p_n = \mathbb{P}(t_n^* \leq t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\exists\ i \leq i_n^* \text{ s.t. } ||T_i^n||_t \geq \eta_n^\alpha\right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\rho,t}\right] &\geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_n^*} \rho^{-i} \mathbb{E}\,||T_i^n||_t \\ &\geq \rho^{-i_n^*} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_n^*} \mathbb{E}\,||T_i^n||_t\,.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\rho,t}\right] &\geq \rho^{-i_n^*} \eta_n^\alpha p_n \\ &= \rho^{-c_{\alpha,\xi} \log_\rho \eta_n} \eta_n^\alpha p_n \\ &= \eta_n^{\alpha - c_{\alpha,\xi}} p_n. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

By (11) we have $c_{\alpha,\xi} \leq \alpha/2$ and thus we have $\eta_n^{\alpha - c_{\alpha,\xi}} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. By Lemma 4 with $\gamma = \rho$ and assumption (15) we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[||T^n||_{\rho,t}\right] < \infty$, so (34) does not diverge to infinity, which implies $p_n \to 0$. This implies $T^n \Rightarrow T$, as desired. □

7 Open questions.

In addition to the questions and conjectures already proposed in Section 3, another potential future direction would be to characterize the detailed behavior of queues of length $\log_d \eta_n + O(1)$. Not only do we conjecture that in steady state almost all queues are of this type, but we also expect that over finite time the process tracking such queues converges to a diffusion process rather than a deterministic system. The methods used in this paper do not naturally translate to the "intermediate length queue" regime.

References

[1] M. Bramson, Lu Yi, and B. Prabhakar. Randomized load balancing with general service time distributions. *Performance Evaluation Review*, 38(1):275 – 286, 2010.

[2] M. Bramson, Lu Yi, and B. Prabhakar. Asymptotic independence of queues under randomized load balancing. *Queueing Systems, Theory and Applications*, 71(3):247 – 292, 2012.

[3] M. Bramson, Lu Yi, and B. Prabhakar. Decay of tails at equilibrium for fifo join the shortest queue networks. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(5):1841 – 1878, 2013.

[4] G. Brightwell and M. Luczak. The supermarket model with arrival rate tending to one. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012.

[5] A. B. Dieker and T. Suk. Randomized longest-queue-first scheduling for large-scale buffered systems. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 47(4):1015 – 1038, 2015.

[6] P. Eschenfeldt and D. Gamarnik. Join the Shortest Queue with Many Servers. The Heavy Traffic Asymptotics. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015.

[7] S. Ethier and T. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008.

[8] Carl Graham. Functional central limit theorems for a large network in which customers join the shortest of several queues. *Probability Theory & Related Fields*, 131(1):97 – 120, 2005.

[9] Quan-Lin Li and John C.S. Lui. Block-structured supermarket models. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 26(2):147–182, 2016.

[10] Malwina J. Luczak and Colin McDiarmid. On the maximum queue length in the supermarket model. *The Annals of Probability*, (2):493, 2006.

[11] Malwina J. Luczak and James Norris. Strong approximation for the supermarket model. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, (3):2038, 2005.

[12] M. Mitzenmacher. On the analysis of randomized load balancing schemes. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 32(3):361–386, 1999.

[13] M. Mitzenmacher. The power of two choices in randomized load balancing. *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, 12(10):1094–1104, 2001.

[14] D Mukherjee, SC Borst, JSH van Leeuwaarden, and PA Whiting. Universality of load balancing schemes on diffusion scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.02657*, 2015.

[15] D Mukherjee, SC Borst, JSH van Leeuwaarden, and PA Whiting. Efficient load balancing in large-scale systems. In *2016 Annual Conference on Information Science and Systems (CISS)*, pages 384–389. IEEE, 2016.

[16] N. D. Vvedenskaya, R. L. Dobrushin, and F. I. Karpelevich. Queueing system with selection of the shortest of two queues: An asymptotic approach. *Probl. Peredachi Inf.*, 32(1):20–34, 1996.

[17] N. D. Vvedenskaya and Y. M. Suhov. Dobrushin's mean-field approximation for a queue with dynamic routing. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 3(4):493–526, 1997.